UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. CONFIRMATION NO. | | |
|----------------------|------------------------------------|----------------------|--------------------------------------|---------------|--|
| 10/567,930 | 02/10/2006 | Yasushi Miyajima | 285627US6PCT | 5384 | |
| | 7590 12/17/200 AK, MCCLELLAND 1 | EXAMINER | | | |
| 1940 DUKE STREET | | | RAJAN, KAI | | |
| ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314 | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER | |
| | | | 3769 | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | NOTIFICATION DATE | DELIVERY MODE | |
| | | | | ELECTRONIC | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentdocket@oblon.com oblonpat@oblon.com jgardner@oblon.com

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

| Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
|-----------------|-----------------|--|
| 10/567,930 | MIYAJIMA ET AL. | |
| English and | | |
| Examiner | Art Unit | |

| | Kai Rajan | 3769 | | | | |
|--|--|---|---|--|--|--|
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appe | ars on the cover sheet with the o | correspondence add | ress | | | |
| THE REPLY FILED <u>24 November 2009</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS | APPLICATION IN CONDITION F | OR ALLOWANCE. | | | | |
| 1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following rapplication in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Apple for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods: | replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi al (with appeal fee) in compliance | t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or | hich places the (3) a Request | | | |
| a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adno event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (I MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f | dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth tter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE | g date of the final rejectio | n. | | | |
| Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extruder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL | ension and the corresponding amount of the hortened statutory period for reply origing the hortened statutory period for reply original for the hortened statutory period for reply original for the hortened statutory period for reply original for the hortened statutory period fo | of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic | te extension fee e action; or (2) as | | | |
| 2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compl filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wi AMENDMENTS | sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to | avoid dismissal of the | | | | |
| 3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, be (a) They raise new issues that would require further core (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below (c) They are not deemed to place the application in bett appeal; and/or (d) They present additional claims without canceling a content of the second c | usideration and/or search (see NOT w); er form for appeal by materially rec | ΓE below); ducing or simplifying th | | | | |
| NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)). 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): 6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowed. | | | | | | |
| non-allowable claim(s). 7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE | ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☐ wil | • | _ | | | |
| The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). | | | | | | |
| 9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to or showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary. 10. The affidavit or other evidence is control. An application of the control of the c | vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea and was not earlier presented. Se | al and/or appellant fails ee 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1) | s to provide a | | | |
| The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation <u>REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER</u> M The request for reconsideration has been considered but | | • | | | | |
| See Continuation Sheet. 12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s) 13. Other: | | | | | | |
| /Henry M. Johnson, III/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3769 | /Kai Rajan/ Examiner, Art Unit 3769 | | | | | |

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant contends that the foreign priority application filed August 19, 2003, for which a certified translation was filed November 24, 2009, antedates the applied prior art. The Examiner agrees that the foreign application antedates the Blattner et al. reference, however after a thorough review of the foreign application believes that important elements of the invention are not disclosed. In particular, the foreign priority application is drawn entirely toward the collection, processing, and display of emotional avatars of individuals. There does not appear to be sufficient disclosure to support the idea of "generating an image including objects that interact with each other." Instead, as discussed in paragraphs 0037 - 0040 of the foreign application, data can be collected for multiple individuals and displayed in a single image. This constitutes a mere display of information which can include an avatar for each individual, but does not comprise an image "based on relationships among the bio-information" and "objects that interact with each other." As such, the Blattner et al. reference, which is relied upon for disclosure of avatars that interact with one another, is not antedated by the disclosure of the foreign priority application. The second reference relied upon for disclosure of the collection of bio-information and determination of emotions, Hata et al., is also not antedated by the foreign application since it was filed December 20, 2001. Therefore, the applied prior art is sufficient to reject the claims as presented. The Applicant is invited to contact the Examiner to discuss suggestions to advance prosecution of the case..